

Summer 6-27-1973

Senate Meeting June 27, 1973

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting June 27, 1973" (1973). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 174.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/174>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

June 27, 1973

Vol. IV, No. 19

Contents

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes

Remarks of the Student Association President

Options in the Presidential Selection Process

CCGR - Technical Changes in the ISU Constitution

Calendar for 1974-75

Appointments to the University Forum Committee

Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee on
Human Resources Management

Committee Reports

Communications

Faculty Status Committee Report on Increments

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

June 27, 1973

Vol. IV, No. 19

CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. in Stevenson 401. The Secretary called the roll and determined that a quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Chairman announced that the minutes had been distributed this evening. The Chairman paused for a few minutes so the members could read the minutes. A motion (Mr. Woods, Ms. Lindstrom) to approve the minutes as distributed passed.

IV, 141

ADMINISTRATIVE REMARKS

There were no administrative remarks. The Chairman recognized the presence of Dean Belshe and Dean Helgeson representing President-designate Budig who is out of state.

REMARKS OF THE STUDENT ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

Mr. McConnell passed out copies of the Student Association Constitution which was passed in a student referendum. Mr. McConnell stated that in the future he would be giving more elaborate reports on the activities of the Student Association. He outlined some of the service-oriented activities of the Student Association such as bail bond, student lawyer, and student stores. Mr. McConnell said that they would in the fall start putting out a consumer type magazine which would be of assistance to students coming into the community. Mr. McConnell said that one of the important activities is to screen the process for the distribution of student fees. Mr. McConnell said that if this process had been in effect longer they probably would not be facing a suit against student fees at the present time. Mr. McConnell stressed again that this was a student oriented organization.

ACTION ITEMS

OLD BUSINESS

The Chairman asked for the permission of the Senate to change the order of the agenda and take up Item 2, Options in the Presidential Selection Process before Item 1, CCGR Report - Technical Changes in the ISU Constitution.

OPTIONS IN THE PRESIDENTIAL SELECTION PROCESS

The Chairman called upon Mr. Young, Chairman of the Administrative Affairs Committee, to report on his committee's study. Mr. Young outlined the essence of

the report. Mr. Young stated that he had researched the past history of presidential selection procedures. Mr. Young stated that in his reading of Board of Regents Minutes he turned up the use of advisory committees within the Northern Illinois University search process. He also alluded to the use of an open forum to produce selection criteria. Mr. Young stated that Secretary of the University Charles Morris had responded by memo to the Presidential Selection Procedures study. Dr. Morris had also volunteered the use of the Secretary's office for logistic support during the selection procedure. Mr. Young spelled out what the Committee considered as the operational definition of the words "conducted", "participation", and "constituted". These are contained in page six of the report. The Committee report will be on file in the Academic Senate Office for those desiring to read it. Mr. Young then referred to a memo which he had written to the Academic Senate. He outlined the pro and con arguments for the various ratios of the student-faculty representation on the committee. Mr. Young also stated that the proposed breakdown on item 6 on page 16 was proposed by a student member of the committee. This called for six faculty, four students, one civil service person, one alumnus(a), and one Board member. Mr. Young recommended a change in the alumni statement so that it would read "The Executive Committee of the ISU Alumni Association Board of Directors." He also recommended striking the words "and transmit the Board member's name to the Academic Senate" from item 8 which would then read "The Board of Regents shall select one member for the Presidential Selection Committee. Mr. Young thanked Mrs. Leonhard for typing and assembling the report and the Senate for its patience during his presentation.

The Chairman recognized the presence of Mrs. Margaret Eckhardt, President of the Civil Service Council, and Vince Vehar, Director of the Alumni Association.

Mr. McConnell called attention to the fact that he had brought a memo to the Executive Committee and that it had been passed by the Executive Committee. Mr. McConnell acknowledged that while it was true that a student member of the Administrative Affairs Committee had suggested the proposed ratio, the student on the committee had raised the question of equal representation during the discussion. Mr. McConnell suggested that it was unfair to that student to suggest that he was selling out students. Mr. Champagne asked that the Executive Committee explain why they undermined the charge to the Administrative Affairs Committee. He asked the Chairman to enlighten the Senate on this procedure of undermining the report before it was presented to the Senate. Mr. Merker explained that it was his interpretation that this was a general policy rather than undermining the specific report yet to be presented. Mr. Champagne asked why this resolution was not brought to the floor of the Senate first. Mr. Champagne said that it appears that Mr. Tarrant had brought advance information to the Executive Committee and what could not be accomplished in the Administrative Affairs Committee was therefore attempted to be accomplished in the Executive Committee. Mr. Merker pointed out that this resolution could have been passed at any one time. Mr. Champagne chastized the Executive Committee for a light turnout and questioned whether or not this was a proper function of the Executive Committee to override a committee report that had

not yet been brought to the full Senate. The Chairman stated that ordinarily the Executive Committee would not act on a report that was on its way to the entire Senate. Mr. McConnell responded to Mr. Champagne's remarks. He alluded to a cover letter attached to his resolution which he feels explains the general purpose of the motion to have equal student-faculty ratio. Mr. McConnell stated that the resolution was drawn up a long time before he went to the Executive Committee meeting and therefore was not in response to Mr. Tarrant's report. He stated that he could not make it to the Administrative Affairs Committee since he had been at the Board of Regents meeting. The intent of the resolution was not to undermine the Administrative Affairs Committee. Mr. Champagne stated that to get the Executive Committee to endorse something in competition with a committee's report is what he would define as an "end run." A debate between Mr. Champagne and Mr. McConnell ensued, uninterrupted by the Chairman. Mr. Mensinger, a member of the Executive Committee, explained that he was not present at the meeting and that he wanted to state that he supported Mr. McConnell's contention that this was another option to be studied. Ms. Clifton asked if this was a tradition of the Senate to go to the Executive Committee for support for something that was coming up on the floor of the Senate. Mr. McConnell cited times in the past when various Senators have gone with a resolution to members of the Senate for specific endorsement. Mr. Hicklin reminded the Senate that he had been absent for the vote but that he had been quoted correctly in the Vidette that this particular move at this time would alert faculty members and had alerted faculty members to opposition of the resolution. Mr. Young pointed out that the resolution endorsed by the Executive Committee was contained in the options listed by the Administrative Affairs Committee. Mr. Wieck stated that if we are going to encourage confidence in the presidential search that it should be the confidence of all members of the university. Mr. Wieck quoted from a section of the report where it is stated that equal representation of students and faculty would undermine the confidence of the faculty in the presidential search. He said it was absurd if we were trying to establish confidence of the faculty and not the students. Only with equal representation would we establish confidence in the search. In answer to Mr. Wieck's question about who were the "others" mentioned, Mr. Young responded that by "others" he meant students and people in the community. Mr. Madore stated that he saw a constituent group, administration, missing from the proposal. In response to Mr. Madore's statement, Mr. Young said that advisory groups might be used to allow various constituencies not necessarily represented on the PSC to participate in the search. Mr. Barford discussed the proposed makeup of the selection committee and the problems of the limits of the committee. He said he understood faculty concern if they begin to lose members below the recommended six. Mr. Barford raised the question about representation of people who are neither faculty nor civil service but who have worked at the University for many years. Mr. Woods made an appeal for senators to rise above the threats of their constituencies and to do the right thing in this matter. Mr. Woods raised a question about the status of the Executive Committee's resolution. The Chairman replied to Mr. Woods' question by reading a statement from the Constitution stating that the action of the Executive Committee was always subject to review by the Academic Senate. Mr. Ficek asked the parliamentarian to rule on whether or not that action was valid. Mr. Rives stated that the Executive

IV, 142

Committee has a right to pass a resolution but it is subject to review by this body. Mr. Ficek went on record supporting the sentiments of Mr. Champagne and viewed the Executive Committee vote as a coercive attempt to influence the Senate vote. Mr. McConnell said that it is unfortunate for Mr. Ficek to consider this as a coercive move. Mr. McConnell stated that he merely considered this to be another option raised for the consideration of the whole Senate. Mr. McConnell called for the Senate to separate the motions to determine the number and structure of the committee and selection procedure. A motion (Mr. McConnell, Mr. Rogers) that the committee be composed of five faculty, five students, two Board of Regents members, two civil service staff, and one past student was introduced. Mr. McConnell spoke in favor of increasing the number of Board of Regents on the committee and the number of civil service staff. Mr. McConnell admitted that conflict has arisen recently among students and faculty. He made a plea for working together. Mr. McConnell pointed out that while there might be threats to the faculty from their colleagues he was calling on them to support equal representation. He stated that this was a step forward in the governing process of Illinois State University. Mr. McConnell stated that in order for faculty to show confidence in students they should vote for this proposal.

The Chairman called on Mrs. Margaret Eckhardt, President of the Civil Service Council, to speak to this motion. (See appendix for the text of Mrs. Eckhardt's statement.) Mrs. Eckhardt thanked Mr. McConnell for including more civil service persons on the presidential selection committee. Mrs. Eckhardt stated that she objected to the Administrative Affairs Committee report stating that civil service staff were unqualified in education. She stated that it was time for people to realize that the university is big business and civil service personnel are qualified to perform the functions dealing with statutory requirements and the innumerable fiscal responsibilities connected with the operation of a big business. She stated that civil service personnel should not be considered to be second class citizens of the University. Mrs. Eckhardt also made the point that in changing the University governance document the civil service should be represented in proportion to the numbers in any future governance of the University. The Chairman thanked President Eckhardt for her presentation.

Mr. Madore called for a recess. The Chairman declared a ten minute recess.

SI42

The Chairman called the meeting to order after the recess and a faculty caucus. The Chairman called on Mr. Young to state his substitute motion. The motion stated that the membership of the Presidential Selection Committee be four faculty, two administrators, four students, one alumnus(a), two civil service, leaving Regency Board membership to be decided by the Board. Mr. McConnell and Mr. Rogers, the makers of the original motion, accepted the substitute. Therefore, the Chairman ruled that this now became the main motion. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Young moved on to selection procedures and made alterations where they had become necessary because of the changed makeup of the committee.

IV, 143

A motion (Mr. Hicklin, Mr. Edwards) that no member of the Executive Committee could serve on the Presidential Selection Committee was made. Mr. Hicklin explained that the rationale for his motion was that the workload of the next few months would place a heavy burden on the Executive Committee and that the time for the completion of the presidential search is so compressed that other people than the Senate Executive Committee should serve on the committee. In addition, if members of the Executive Committee such as the president of the student body or the chairman of the Senate are on the committee they have somewhat of a weighted voice. Even though he seconded the motion, Mr. Edwards stated that he objected to the motion on the grounds that no one should be excluded from being on the committee. Mr. Young supported Mr. Edwards' contention. Mr. McConnell stated that even though he was president of the student body he did not feel that his voice would be weighted on the selection committee were he to serve. The motion lost on a voice vote.

IV, 144

IV, 145

A question was raised about the definition of administrators. The Chairman recommended that the definition of administrator as defined in the Constitution for purpose of Academic Senate service be used as a criterion. It is the Chairman's interpretation that it is the sense of the Senate that executive assistants would be included in the administrative group. Mr. McConnell pointed out that the Student Association included many different groups and asked if "Student Association Assembly" was the intent. The Chairman of the Administrative Affairs Committee stated that this had been the intention of the Administrative Affairs Committee when it stated Student Association. A motion (Mr. Young, Mr. Madore) to accept the selection procedures as amended passed unanimously. A motion (Mr. Young, Mr. Madore) to accept the screening procedures as given on page 18, 19 and the addendum was discussed. There was some discussion about what the statement should be on who should see the semifinal candidates. It was suggested that the words "members of the University community" be substituted. It was pointed out that this is a very large number of people and that perhaps specific limitations should be imposed on who the presidential candidate should reasonably be expected to meet when he comes to campus. Various discussion took place about how to phrase this item. A question was raised about how many people would be visiting sites. Much discussion took place on the problems of expanding input to the committee versus the crunch of the time span. Mr. McConnell suggested a compromise wording. Mr. Champagne suggested the revision of six and the elimination of nine. The motion to approve the screening procedures as revised passed unanimously. (See appendix for the PSC Procedures.)

CCGR - TECHNICAL CHANGES IN THE ISU CONSTITUTION

The members of the CCGR were invited to the table. Present were Mr. Leary, Mr. Fuess, Mr. Eimermann, and Ms. Huser. Mr. Rogers asked if a quorum was still present. It was determined that a quorum was present. There was no objection voiced by any member to any of the items. The Committee was commended for their work. Mr. Eimermann stated that revisions had been provided the Senate

to conform to its discussion. It was agreed that Mrs. Leonhard and the Committee will get together and reproduce the revisions in a single document for consideration by the Senate. Mr. Smith raised a question about what kind of participation the faculty and students would have in a management structure change. Mr. Eimmermann explained the Board Policy in this matter and how this should be incorporated into a revised constitution.

NEW BUSINESS

CALENDAR FOR 1974-75 (See appendix)

IV, 146

The next item on the agenda was the 1974-75 calendar. A motion (Mr. Young, Mr. McConnell) to accept the calendar as presented by Dean Belshe passed.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE UNIVERSITY FORUM COMMITTEE

IV, 147

A motion (Mr. Roderick, Mr. Rogers) to accept the appointments as presented carried. (See attached list.)

REPORT OF THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

IV, 148

Mr. Madore reported for the Faculty Affairs Committee on Human Resources Management. The committee suggested the establishment of a task force to study reduction policies. A motion (Mr. Madore, Mr. Rogers) that the Executive Committee of the Senate establish a university task force representing all of the primary constituent groups (faculty, administration, administration staff, students and civil service) for the purpose of recommending changes in our personnel practices which would reflect an enlightened concept of human resources management. It is anticipated that the task force would be ready to report by November 1973" was made. Mr. Champagne raised the question of whether this task force should deal with hiring practices as well as retraining and dismissal practices. The motion passed unanimously.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Executive Committee - Mr. Merker reported for the Executive Committee. He also reported on House Bill 1628 which allows for non-voting student members on the various governing boards including the Board of Regents.

Academic Affairs Committee - Mr. Champagne announced that a meeting would be held next week.

Administrative Affairs Committee - Mr. Young reported that the Commemorative Policy will be sent to the Executive Committee soon.

COMMUNICATIONS

It was reported that Mr. Madore had been elected acting chairman of the Joint University Advisory Committee.

IV, 149

A motion (Mr. Kachur, Mr. Wieck) to adjourn was approved unanimously. The faculty moved to an executive session.

FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE REPORT ON INCREMENTS

For the Executive Committee,

Charles R. Hicklin, Secretary

CRHpl

NAME	ATTEN- DANCE	VOTE							VOICE VOTE		
		Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion No.	yes	no
Amster	A								141	X	
Barford	P								142	X	
Brundage	A								143		X
Cerwinski	A								144	X	
Champaigne	P								145	X	
Chesebro	P								146	X	
Clifton	P								147	X	
Duty	P								148	X	
Edwards	P								149	X	
Ficek	P										
Friedberg	A										
Fuehrer	P										
Harpole	P										
Hicklin	P										
Johnson	P										
Johnston	A										
Kachur	P										
Kagy	P										
Liberta	P										
Lindstrom	P										
Linne	P										
Little	P										
Madore	P										
McMillan	P										
Mead	A										
Mensinger	P										
Merker	P										
Potter	P										
Rennels	P										
Rex	P										
Roderick	P										
Rogers	P										
Smith	P										
Stein	P										
Stoner	P										
Sutherland	A										
Tarrant	A										
VanTine	P										
White	P										
Wieck	P										
Wissmiller	P										
Workman	A										
Wong	A										
Woods	P										
Young	P										
McConnell	P										
Barlo	A										
Rudin	A*										
Johnson	A										

*Sent representatives

NOT OFFICIAL POLICY UNTIL APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF REGENTS

PRESIDENTIAL SELECTION COMMITTEE
POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Academic Senate at its regular meeting on June 27, 1973 unanimously passed motions which recommend to the Board of Regents adoption of the following policy statements:

A. Structure of the Presidential Selection Committee (PSC).

1. The PSC shall consist of thirteen (13) members of the University community in addition to those members of the committee from the Board of Regents appointed by the Board.
2. The members of the University community shall be distributed on the PSC as follows:

4	Teaching faculty
4	Students
2	Administration
2	Civil Service
1	Alumni
<hr/>	
13	Total

3. The definitions of the five groups in item 2 shall be as follows:

Teaching faculty shall mean all those who hold full-time faculty rank in an academic department and who have administrative duties of less than half-time.

Students shall mean all those defined as full-time students in residence by current University policy.

Administration shall refer to all those who have administrative duties of half time or more and who hold faculty rank in an academic department. This term is meant to include department chairmen. Other administrative employees who do not qualify as faculty or civil service employees are also included.

Civil Service shall mean all those defined as full-time civil service employees by current University policy.

Alumni shall mean all those holding an earned degree awarded by the University.

B. Selection of the Presidential Selection Committee.

1. The selection of the faculty membership of the PSC shall be according to the following guidelines:

- a. Each academic department may nominate no one, one, or two faculty.
 - b. Nominations of faculty may be made from the floor of the Academic Senate by faculty senators only.
 - c. The Academic Senate shall elect four faculty to the PSC from those nominated.
 - d. No college shall have more than one faculty member on the PSC.
 - e. No academic department shall have more than one faculty or administrator on the PSC.
2. The administrative representatives of the PSC shall be selected according to the following guidelines:
 - a. Nominations of administrative representatives shall be by open nomination by administrative employees.
 - b. The Academic Senate shall elect two administrative employees from the nominations.
3. The selection of the student membership of the PSC shall be according to the following guidelines:
 - a. The Student Association Assembly shall nominate ten students.
 - b. Nominations of students may be made from the floor of the Academic Senate by student senators only.
 - c. The Academic Senate shall elect four students to the PSC.
4. The Executive Committee of the ISU Alumni Association Board of Directors shall select one alumnus(a) for the PSC and transmit the name of the alumnus(a) to the Academic Senate.
5. The Civil Service Council shall select two civil service staff for the PSC and transmit the civil service staff names to the Academic Senate.
6. The Board of Regents shall select their own member or members to serve on the PSC.
7. The Chairman of the Academic Senate shall transmit the complete membership list of the PSC to the Board of Regents for final review and approval.
8. The PSC shall elect a chairman and secretary from among the membership of the PSC.

C. Presidential Selection Committee Procedures.

1. The Chairman of the PSC shall present a report at all meetings of the Academic Senate during the time allowed for Committee Reports.

2. No candidate for President shall be disqualified solely on the basis of present position.
3. The PSC shall make all effort to insure that the President shall begin official duties in January, 1974, or as soon as possible thereafter.
4. All correspondence from candidates for the Presidency shall be sent to the Chairman of the PSC in care of the Academic Senate Office at Illinois State University. Copies of all materials shall be forwarded to the Springfield office of the Executive Secretary of the Board of Regents.
5. The PSC shall develop pertinent criteria for the Presidential candidate and submit these criteria to the Academic Senate for review. The Chairman of the Academic Senate shall present the criteria to the Board of Regents for final review and approval.
6. The Academic Senate and other appropriate University and community bodies shall have ample time to interview the semi-final presidential candidates who are invited to the campus by the PSC.
7. The names of the three finalists shall be presented to the Academic Senate in executive session for information only. The Chairman of the Academic Senate shall present the names of the three finalists to the Board of Regents for final selection.
8. The PSC shall establish additional screening procedures which are deemed necessary for its work. These procedures shall be submitted to the Academic Senate for review. The Chairman of the Academic Senate shall present the additional screening procedures to the Board of Regents for final review.
9. An open forum or other means shall be used to solicit information to aid the PSC in producing detailed and specific selection criteria.
10. Provisions shall be made to visit the present employment sites of the semi-final or final candidates in order to conduct extensive interviews of the candidates' subordinates, peers, and supervisors.
11. An adequate budget shall be provided for the PSC to carry out its work, including visitation of the present employment sites of the semi-final or final candidates.

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

Proposed 1974-75 Academic Calendar

FIRST SEMESTER

Thursday, August 22 and
Friday, August 23
Monday, August 26
Monday, September 2
Friday, October 18
Monday, October 21
Wednesday, November 27
Monday, December 2
Saturday, December 14
through Friday, December 20
Friday, December 20

Registration
Classes begin
Labor Day
First nine-week block ends, 5 p.m.
Second nine-week block begins
Thanksgiving vacation begins, noon
Classes resume, 8 a.m.

Evaluation and Review Period
First semester ends, 5 p.m.

SECOND SEMESTER, 1975

Thursday, January 9 and
Friday, January 10
Monday, January 13
Friday, March 7
Friday, March 7
Monday, March 17
Monday, March 17
Saturday, May 10
through Friday, May 16
Friday, May 16
Saturday, May 17

Registration
Classes begin
First nine-week block ends, 5 p.m.
Spring vacation begins, 5 p.m.
Classes resume, 8 a.m.
Second nine-week block begins

Evaluation and Review Period
Second semester ends, 5 p.m.
Commencement

SUMMER SESSIONS, 1975

Monday, June 2
through Friday, June 20
Monday, June 23
through Friday, August 15
(Friday, July 4)

Pre-session (1, 2 and 3 week courses)

Eight week session
Holiday

Summary of class meeting times

First Semester, 46 MWF class meetings
Second Semester, 48 MWF class meetings

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS TO FORUM COMMITTEE

University Forum Committee

Mr. Chris Carlson
Ms. Lori Frankland
Mr. Nchewi Imoke
Ms. Sherry Jastrzab
Mr. Steve Jones
Ms. Rita McLaughlin
Mr. Anthony Thomas

alternates -

Mr. Leonard Aronz
Mr. Ronald Duehr
Mr. Andy Monteleone

Memorandum

To: Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

Fr: Faculty Affairs Committee

Background

Additions to staff are regulated by established appointment practices which involve shared input and responsibility by both peer and employer.

When circumstances require a reduction in force, there exists no parallel set of guidelines to govern the decisions which must be made. The Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate finds this problem to involve more than staff reduction policies. The whole question of human resources management needs to be reviewed in the context of a declining job market.

It is the Committee's opinion that this task should be studied by a group with wide university participation.

Attached you will find the major points given in the preliminary report prepared by the ad hoc committee. Our Committee is anxious to provide input to the task force when it is formed.

Proposed Motion

Moved by the Faculty Affairs Committee that the Executive Committee of the Senate establish a university task force representing all of the primary constituent groups (faculty, administration, administration staff, students and civil service) for the purpose of recommending changes in our personnel practices which would reflect an enlightened concept of human resources management. It is anticipated that the task force would be ready to report by November 1973.

HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Rationale:

The retention of qualified university personnel may be the essential difference between educational success and failure. The University should establish procedures whereby an effort is made to retain qualified faculty and staff and place them in positions where their talents are most needed and can be most effectively utilized so that greater efficiency and effectiveness will result. Thus, it is important to relocate displaced faculty and staff by means of transfers or promotions into positions within the University where their abilities will best suit the objectives of the educational community.

Proposals:

It is proposed that there be established a comprehensive data bank dealing with all aspects of faculty employment concerns. Among these data should be information dealing with:

1. Identification of the pattern of shifts taking place amongst the student populations. For example, discernible trends in enrollment shifts from one department to the other, and selection patterns for particular disciplines.
2. Descriptive information dealing with the cyclic changes in societal priorities.
3. Comparison of changes in the early declaration of majors expressed by students, and the number of graduates in those particular fields. It would be useful to know the amount of shifting from early declaration of major interest and possibly to identify those factors contributing to changes in declaration. Perhaps here we can discover the extent to which university factors influence career decisions.
4. Data on the patterns of training for faculty at this University. Here it may be desirable to identify patterns of course distribution, as well as information dealing with special interest and/or avocations that may be represented. The intent is to find out the extent of interest, related training, and second occupations that may exist among the faculty.
5. One of the purposes for such a data bank would be to assist in identifying new career options, but it would also be valuable to attempt to identify what appears to be new and emerging disciplines in the related sources of content upon which specific skills and information requirements for these disciplines rests. While this short list of topics is by no means complete, it does serve to spell out the concept of a data bank and some of the implied uses which may be made of the information.

Recommendations:

1. Establish due process guarantees for all faculty and staff.
2. Establish a job information clearinghouse for faculty-civil service classifications dealing with all campus vacancies as well as the publishing of off-campus notices.
3. Develop an internship program within the units of the University which will provide personnel service while providing new or additional expertise for personnel about to be displaced. The purpose would be to provide services to a department and retraining to the person without necessarily providing a job guarantee.
4. Develop and implement a program whereby displaced faculty are relocated to other units of the University or in placements within industry, colleges and universities outside this campus.
5. Recognize the validity of sabbaticals to persons with needed retraining goals.
6. Establish funds to subsidize the undertakings of the faculty finding themselves displaced or in areas being deemphasized. The form of this could be through low cost loans or special departmental retraining grants that would encourage a department to take on the responsibility for trainees without decreasing its resources for its primary mission.
7. Liberalize the leave option so that faculty members may try out other occupations without severing their basic job security at the primary institution. Here, it may be possible to identify individuals who find themselves in an area of decreased emphasis and not yet facing termination of employment, but desirous of trying out a new career option on a one or more year basis.

It is important that the specific policies, procedures, facilitating operations exist within the University structure in order to implement the Human Resources Management Program.

NMpl

Note: This material represents the Faculty Affairs Committee's discussion of an ad hoc committee report dealing with the need for faculty retraining.